

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. Patent Appln. No. 10/037,639

Attorney Docket No. 71150.0774

REMARKS

Claims 15-28 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1-14 have been canceled and Claims 18-28 added. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 15 due to informalities. Claim 15 has been amended in line with the Examiner's suggestion, which should obviate the Examiner's objection.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-14 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 15-17 have been amended to assure that they are clear and definite, and not for reasons of patentability.

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bamforth et al. (US 6,330,617) – hereafter "Bamforth". Claims 2, 3, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bamforth in view of *Sockets Tutorial* (<http://web.archive.org/web/19990502045433/http://www.cs.rpi.edu/courses/sysprog/sockets/sock.html.5/2/1999>) – hereafter "RPI". Claims 4-7 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bamforth in view of RPI, and further in view of *Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) 1.1* (URL: <http://www.w3.org/TR/2000/NOTE-SOAP-20000508/5/8/2000>) – hereinafter "SOAP Spec". Finally, Claims 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bamforth in view of SOAP Spec.

Claims 1-14 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 18-28 have been added. For the following reasons, the prior art rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Applicant respectfully submits that neither Bamforth nor the SOAP Spec., individually or in combination, teaches or suggests a method for handling requests using a computer, including: translating the request message from the first format to a second format; wrapping the translated message in a SOAP (Simple Object Access Protocol) packet; parsing the SOAP packet to determine the operation being called; calling the operation upon a server; creating a SOAP response document from the response from

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. Patent Appln. No. 10/037,639

Attorney Docket No. 71150.0774

the server; unwrapping the SOAP response document; converting the response from the second format to the first format; and transmitting a response message in the first format, as recited in Claim 15.

Rather, Bamforth discloses a completely different type of operation – that of converting messages in a variable field format into a fixed format such that service providers can communicate electronically with a CRS that employs the Edifact protocol. In the Bamforth invention, a conversion engine 203 (processor) receives an Edifact or other variable field message from a CRS or other computer system, determines or identifies the type of data in that segment or field (including downloading predefined software functions from a function library), determines the location of that type of data in the corresponding fixed format message, removes unnecessary protocol information from the data, assembles the fixed format message, and then maps data from the Edifact or other variable field message to the fields in the fixed format message by positioning the data, typically without the protocol information, in the corresponding fields for that data in the fixed format message. The assembled fixed format message is sent to a client machine or other computer system or network. (See col. 6, lines 17-54).

However, in the present invention, the message is first translated into a second format, then the translated message is wrapped in a SOAP (Simple Object Assess Protocol) packet; the SOAP packet is parsed to determine the operation being called; the operation is called upon a server; a SOAP response document is created from the response from the server; the SOAP response document is unwrapped and converted back from the second format to the first format; and a response message is transmitted in the first format.

However, Bamforth uses a data converter 201 only for providing a fixed format message to a client machine 207, and is not translating messages back and forth between formats using the SOAP, but rather, is replacing portions of a message such that the resulting fixed format message can be sent to a client machine or other computer system or network.

Further, there is no motivation to combine the SOAP reference with that of Bamforth, since Bamforth specifically addresses the Edifact protocol which is used by CRS's (see col. 4, lines 18-21). Thus, the Examiner is using impermissible hindsight in selecting the SOAP reference and combining it

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. Patent Appln. No. 10/037,639

Attorney Docket No. 71150.0774

with Bamforth to achieve the claimed features of the present invention. Clearly, Bamforth is complete in itself, and could not use the SOAP without substantial modification to their methods and device. The fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The Examiner is reminded that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Further, even if combined, the combined references would not achieve the claimed features of the present invention, since Bamforth is complete in itself, and only addresses mapping data from an input message to specified fields in an output message. Thus, assuming *arguendo* the Bamforth reference was to be combined with SOAP, the resulting invention would simply use SOAP to address mapping data from an input message to specified fields in an output message – which is not related to the claims of the present invention.

Accordingly, Claim 15 is not obvious over either the individual or the combination of the Bamforth and SOAP references, and the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

Further, the recitations of Claim 17 are not taught or suggested by either Bamforth or SOAP, either individually or in combination.

Accordingly, Claim 17 is patentable over Bamforth and SOAP.

Further, since Claims 16-17 depend from Claim 15, they are also patentable over the applied prior art by virtue of their dependency.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. Patent Appln. No. 10/037,639

Attorney Docket No. 71150.0774

With respect to new Claim 18, the Applicant respectfully submits that the applied prior art does not teach or suggest a computer system for handling requests, including a server for receiving commands and transmitting responses; at least one client computer system for transmitting request messages and receiving response messages in a first format; a translator which checks the request messages from the client computer system for protocol and format, and translates the request messages into a second format which is a protocol and format which is understood by the server; a processor which receives the translated request messages from the translator in a second format, transforms the translated request messages into commands that can be understood by the server, one of calls and commands information from the server, receives responses from the server, processes the responses from the server into processed response messages in the second format, and transmits the processed response messages to the translator in the second format; wherein the translator receives the processed response messages from the processor in the second format, translates the processed response messages into the first format, and transmits the translated response messages to the client computer system in the first format.

As stated above, Bamforth is directed to a completely different type of operation, and the combination of SOAP with Bamforth, even if proper, does not render the claimed features of the present invention obvious.

With respect to new Claims 19-28, since they depend from Claim 18, they are also patentable over the applied prior art by virtue of their dependency.

If the Examiner believes that there is any issue which could be resolved by a telephone or personal interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. Patent Appln. No. 10/037,639

Attorney Docket No. 71150.0774

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such an extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 04-1061.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean C. Edwards
Jean C. Edwards
Registration No. 41,728

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC
1901 L St., N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: 202/659-6946
Facsimile: 202/659-1559
Date: May 26, 2005

DC 71150-774 100123v1

Certificate of Transmission Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (703) 872-9306 on May 26, 2005.

Pamela Cai
Pamela Cai